

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Aime Richards (aime@hattiesrestaurant.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 3:06 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Aime Richards
10 Canterbury Cir
Pinehurst, NC 28374
aime@hattiesrestaurant.com

(518) 281-6467

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Mike Genovese (mikedgenovese@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:00 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

Duke Power has shown a clear history of pushing their costs of poor management into its customers - just look at the coal tar ash fiasco. Do the right thing!

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Mike Genovese

1355 Twogreen Ln
Newton, NC 28658
mikedgenovese@gmail.com
(828) 464-9133

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Andrea Haag (rubberbandgrl@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:01 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Andrea Haag
6304 Ballinger Rd
Greensboro, NC 27410
rubberbandgrl@gmail.com

(319) 325-9329

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Mary Wakeman (mkwakeman1@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:12 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Mary Wakeman
2710 Azalea Dr
Greensboro, NC 27407
mkwakeman1@gmail.com

(336) 404-3109

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Cynthia Mastro (utvol61@inteliport.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Mastro
101 Hunters Trl W
Elizabeth City, NC 27909
utvol61@inteliport.com

(252) 338-2708

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Pam Mclamb (pammclamb@nc.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:58 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Pam Mclamb
228 Tamworth Dr
Willow Spring, NC 27592
pammclamb@nc.rr.com

(919) 285-9095

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Lee Warren (lwarrenhky@charter.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:58 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Lee Warren
1222 12th Street PI NW
Hickory, NC 28601
lwarrenhky@charter.net

(828) 855-7539

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Matthew Smith (matthew.mlsmith@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 12:54 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Matthew Smith
1782 New Hope Rd
Hertford, NC 27944
matthew.mlsmith@gmail.com

(251) 689-1240

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Yvonne Moody (yvonne37@bellsouth.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 11:56 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Moody
609 Marsh Grass Ct
Southport, NC 28461
yvonne37@bellsouth.net

(910) 454-9051

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Elizabeth Hecker (heckerr@ecu.edu) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hecker
434 Vernon White Rd
Winterville, NC 28590
heckerr@ecu.edu

(252) 756-3078

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: smtprelay
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 10:14 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Treneattia Bowman

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Treneattia Bowman

Email

treneattiab@gmail.com

Docket

000000000

Message

I am upset with duke energy with them not working with me to do another agreement considering the fact that they used interest from a deposit on a second installment; which was not a part of the agreement. During Florence my internet services did not work properly and I was out of work because I work from home. I didnt clear the amount requested for today's installment. I work two jobs to pay our energy bills; which are twice as expensive as a neighbor less than 50 feet away. This is for Stephanie, and the last representative who consider being disgruntled; the opposite. Mannerable and persistent. I beleive they are highly undertrained. The analyst on August 29, 2018 lied on his notes. Confirmation Number: 97783683 Scheduled Payment Date: 08/30/2018 Payment Amount: \$145.00 Fee Amount: \$1.50 Total Amount: \$146.50 Last 4 of Card: 6866

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: John Bradshaw (jbradshaw10@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 9:28 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

John Bradshaw
2322 Knickerbocker Dr
Charlotte, NC 28212
jbradshaw10@att.net

(704) 535-2035

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Judith Howell (judiannhowell@icloud.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 9:26 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Judith Howell
353 Fairway Ln Apt H
Spruce Pine, NC 28777
judiannhowell@icloud.com

(828) 385-9449

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Matt Lail (provident.appraiser@outlook.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 9:01 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Matt Lail
5438 Valley Forge Rd
Charlotte, NC 28210
provident.appraiser@outlook.com

(704) 813-0381

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: smtprelay
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 10:42 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Statement of Position Submitted by Treneattia Bowman

Statement of Position Submitted

Name

Treneattia Bowman

Email

treneattialaw@icloud.com

Docket

00000000000

Message

This is for the last two analysts who want to jeopardize records and documents with poorly written case notes, and diction. The past two analysts need not confuse their personal flaws with highly trained consumers who participate in the same roles: This if for them (I am paid to analyze well): Date Description Amount Balance
Pending Extended Hold \$\$\$\$ / Release Date 12/05/2018 -\$1,965.00 09/26/2018 Deposit \$1,965.00 \$1,965.00

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties by an authorized state official.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Gilda Friedman (gildafriedman@msn.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:35 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Gilda Friedman
4315 Dogwood Dr
Greensboro, NC 27410
gildafriedman@msn.com

(336) 339-2866

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Andy McGlinn (andymcglinn@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:24 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Andy McGlinn
3901 River Front Pl Unit 203
Wilmington, NC 28412
andymcglinn@gmail.com

(920) 883-9908

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Julienne Johnson (jbjohnson118@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:22 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Julienne Johnson
4135 Abbington Ter
Wilmington, NC 28403
jbjohnson118@hotmail.com

(910) 392-5085

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

b

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Madison Frazier (frazier.madison1@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:18 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Madison Frazier
5329 Prosperity Ridge Rd
Charlotte, NC 28269
frazier.madison1@gmail.com

(828) 776-4615

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Vicki Routh (vrouth@accordant.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:11 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Vicki Routh
3362 Beaver Creek Rd
Randleman, NC 27317
vrouth@accordant.net

(336) 953-1095

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Jacob Yow (yow-j@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:08 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Jacob Yow
2300 E 4th St
Greenville, NC 27858
yow-j@hotmail.com

(336) 964-1014

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Isabel Cervera (isabellacer@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 8:02 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Isabel Cervera
2118 S Main St
Salisbury, NC 28147
isabellacer@hotmail.com

(234) 336-6150

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Katherine Tripp (ktripp23@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 7:31 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Katherine Tripp
4240 Lake Brandt Rd
Greensboro, NC 27455
ktripp23@aol.com

(336) 202-2896

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Lydia Barber (lbarber411@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 7:42 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Lydia Barber
420 Forest Hill Ave
Winston Salem, NC 27105
lbarber411@aol.com

(336) 744-0111

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Christy Jenkins (bamboo_marbles@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 7:23 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Christy Jenkins
239 Riverwood Dr
Hertford, NC 27944
bamboo_marbles@hotmail.com

(252) 339-2032

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Catherine Denham (cathydenham99@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:46 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Catherine Denham
111 Peters Pl
Davidson, NC 28036
cathydenham99@gmail.com

(704) 892-8324

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Devon Seltzer (daikajutanuki@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:46 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Devon Seltzer
5856 Old Oak Ridge Rd Apt 1603
Greensboro, NC 27410
daikajutanuki@gmail.com

(336) 887-5484

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Madeline Perkins (madelineperkins19@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:19 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Madeline Perkins
1644 Greasy Creek Rd
Bakersville, NC 28705
madelineperkins19@gmail.com

(828) 688-3711

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Lucinda Williams (lmwilliams105@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:16 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Lucinda Williams
2238 White Oak Road
Burnsville, NC 28714
lmwilliams105@gmail.com

(404) 276-5901

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Annette Tenny (kavanagh777@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 6:00 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquified Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Annette Tenny
1097 N Stokes School Rd
Danbury, NC 27016
kavanagh777@gmail.com

(336) 593-9809

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Joe Detaranto (jdetaranto@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 3:54 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Joe Detaranto
7121 Barefoot Forest Dr
Charlotte, NC 28269
jdetaranto@gmail.com

(980) 585-1185

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: D. Bullock (dhubullock2@bellsouth.net) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 3:49 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

D. Bullock
1007 Surry Dr
Greensboro, NC 27408
dhubullock2@bellsouth.net

(336) 282-3128

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Laurie Strutton (lauriestrutton@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 2:53 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquified Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Laurie Strutton
6444 Brittany Rd
Rocky Mount, NC 27803
lauriestrutton@yahoo.com

(252) 451-0963

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Carol Simpson (usercas2999@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 1:18 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Carol Simpson
3000 W Cornwallis Dr
Greensboro, NC 27408
usercas2999@aol.com

(336) 632-4457

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Patrick Jean (patrickinn@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message
<automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 12:49 AM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Patrick Jean
3910 Herman Sipe Road
Conover, NC 28613
patrickinn@gmail.com

(828) 310-5575

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.

Threatt, Linnetta

From: Mary Rogers (msrogers1027@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 11:40 PM
To: Statements
Subject: Docket Number is G-9, Sub 727 for Piedmont's Annual Review of Gas Costs proceeding

Dear North Carolina Utilities Commission,

In its recent filing to the NC Utilities Commission, Piedmont Natural Gas Company fails to show that its gas costs were prudently incurred. The Commission should take a hard look at Piedmont's gas purchasing practices to make sure that it is ensuring the lowest cost for its customers. Piedmont itself and its parent company, Duke Energy, are a primary owner of the proposed \$6+ billion Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP). The Commission should be concerned that Duke and Piedmont are engaging in self-dealing, and passing unreasonable costs onto captive rate payers to make a lucrative profit for Duke shareholders.

Piedmont claims its gas costs incurred are "prudent", however the ACP and the proposed Piedmont Pipeline, are not needed to meet demand for gas in North Carolina. There is enough capacity on the existing Transco pipeline. In fact, Transco recently made a filing with the South Carolina Public Service Commission stating "Transco has the infrastructure and pipeline in place to serve the Southeast, including South Carolina, for many years." The same is true for North Carolina. Simultaneously, Piedmont fails to offer comprehensive energy efficiency programs for customers, and NCUC should require other programs to reduce Piedmont's costs and help customers save money on their bills.

The Commission should not allow Piedmont to charge customers for building unnecessary pipelines like the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the sole purpose of which is not to meet demand or provide lowest cost resources for customers, but rather to make more profit for Piedmont and Duke Energy shareholders at the expense of already vulnerable communities and ratepayers. Furthermore, the Commission should apply heightened scrutiny to determine whether rate hikes related to new pipeline transportation costs are just and reasonable, especially when affiliate self-dealing is involved, as in this case.

The Commission should also look carefully at Piedmont's claim that the new Liquefied Natural Gas facility proposed in Robeson County "need is independent from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) supply." We request an independent study ensuring this major infrastructure project is necessary and worth the cost of ~\$250 million to ratepayers. The Commission should also assert their authority to review the contracts between Duke and Piedmont regarding this facility and the relationship with the proposed ACP.

In addition to applying higher scrutiny in this docket, I request the NCUC act in the best interest of North Carolina customers by asserting their authority to review contracts between the utilities they regulate and the proposed gas pipelines in which affiliates of these same companies are investing. NCUC should also file protests in relevant FERC pipeline dockets immediately, demanding that FERC fully evaluate the market need for any new pipeline that would impact their state's ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Mary Rogers
2212 Valencia Terrace
Charlotte, NC 28226
msrogers1027@yahoo.com